

Remarks

This responds to the restriction requirement imposed by the Office in the action mailed on September 10, 2009. Applicants respectfully request that examination of the application proceed for the claim group elected below.

Restriction Requirement

In the Office action dated September 10, 2009 ("Action"), the Examiner imposes a two-way restriction requirement. In particular, the Examiner has required restriction of the application between two groups as follows: Group I (claims 7-11) and Group II (claims 18-24).

Election With Traverse

The Applicant elects Group II (claims 18-24) with traverse.

The Examiner misinterpreted claim 7. The request for disconnection does not come from the remote resource. Instead, either of the first and second applications requests a disconnection "from" the remote resource. This seemed fairly clear given the context of the claim, but if each individual phrase is taken out of context, it is easy to see why the Examiner interpreted the claim to mean that the remote resource is making the request.

Applicant has amended claim 7 to make certain that a restriction is avoided. Applicant does not want the Examiner to search for a disconnection request that is initiated by a remote resource. Such a search would not be directed to the language or meaning of the current claims.

Given the amendment of the claims, it is believed that both Groups I and II should remain in the application.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney if the Examiner believes that doing so would further the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

One World Trade Center, Suite 1600
121 S.W. Salmon Street
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 595-5300
Facsimile: (503) 595-5301

By



Robert F. Scotti
Registration No. 39,830